REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated **April 5, 2005,** applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim Status

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-9, 13-17, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,336,124 to Alam et al., hereinafter "Alam" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,186 to Kuroda et al., hereinafter "Kuroda." Claims 10-12 and 18-20 have been objected to form, but are noted as being otherwise allowable. Applicant appreciates the examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of/objections to claims 1-23 in view of the following. Claim 7 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the examiner interview of May 12, 2005. While no agreement was reached regarding allowable claims, applicant appreciates the examiner's discussion of claim 1.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 7 has been amended to recite each "display instance" instead of each "second file." Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103
Independent Claims 1, 13, and 21

Independent claims 1, 13, and 21 include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, namely as represented by claim 1:

    1.   (Currently Amended) A method for creating and displaying stylized digital content, the method comprising:
        reading a first file containing a digital content item to be stylized;
        reading a plurality of second files, each second file containing at least one style definition and each second file containing a different set of style definitions;
        creating a plurality of display instances of stylized digital content by applying the at least one style definition from each second file to the digital content item of the first file;
        *mapping each of the **plurality of display instances** of stylized content to a different area of a display device;*
        receiving a selection of a location on the display device from a pointing device, the location corresponding to an area of the display device mapped to one of the plurality of display instances of stylized content; and
        displaying the one of the plurality of display instances of stylized content corresponding to the received selection of the location on the display device. (emphasis added)

None of the cited references discloses or suggests creating a plurality of display instances of stylized digital content and mapping each of the plurality of display instances to a different area of a display device, as recited by the claims. The examiner concedes that Alam does not disclose a plurality of styles and thus, cannot disclose a plurality of display instances of stylized digital content and that it does not disclose mapping each of the display instances to a different area of a display device.

As such, the examiner relies on Kuroda. Kuroda, however, does not disclose or suggest creating a plurality of display instances and mapping the display instances to different areas of a display device, as recited by the claims. In contrast, Kuroda only creates one display instance of stylized content, which is based on a user selection of a particular format (Kuroda at Fig. 2). Kuroda's approach to formatting is conventional – select a format (e.g., from the screen of Fig. 2), create a display instance using the selected format, display the instance on the screen (on a different screen from that shown in Fig. 2), change screens back to select a new format (e.g., go back to the screen of Fig. 2), create a new display instance using the new format, display the new instance on the screen (on a new screen). This conventional approach to displaying content is slow and cumbersome for the user. In

contrast, the claims recite creating a plurality of display instances and mapping those display instances to areas of a display device. In this manner, a user can very quickly "preview" many display instances of stylized digital content by simply selecting a location on the display device. Because the display instances have already been created, they can very quickly be previewed by the user.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are allowable. Additionally, inasmuch as dependent claims 2-12, 14-20, and 22-23 (which have also been rejected and or objected to) are dependent on one of claims 1, 13, and 21, these claims are patentable, at least by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of/objections to claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Raymond N. Scott Jr. at (215) 564-8951, to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: July 6, 2005

_____
Raymond N. Scott, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,666

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439